duction along with the year of commencement of production of each ?

THE MINISTER OF INDUSTRY (SHRI J. VENGAL RAO) : (a) Sales turnover 15 not monitored.

(b) The required details to the extent available are given in the attached statement:

Statement

Name of drug/Name of the Companj	Whether implemen-ted the licence	Year of commencement of production
VTTMTN Bl		
1. i.n.p.L.	Yes	Not available. However the company is in prodac-tion.
VITAMIN B2		
I. t.D.P.L.	Yes	-do
VITAMIN B6		
1. I. DP.L.	Yes	-do-
2. Lupin Labs.	Yes	March, 1987
3. Themis Chemicals	Yes	1981
VITAMIN BI2		
1. Merind	Yes	1980
2. Themis Chemicals	Yes	1981
3. Themis Pharma	Yes	1981
4. Alembic Chemical;	Yes	1981
VITAMIN D3		
1. Duphar Interfran	Yes	1980

Overcharging by M/s. Prfaer Ltd.

4549. SHRI BHAGATRAM MANHAR : Will the Minister of INDUSTRY be pleased to refer to the answer to Unstarred Question 650 given in the Rajya Sabha on the U» Alienist IQR8 and state :

(a) what are the names of the bulk drugs and formulations in respect of which an amount of Rs.48,21 lakhs has been assessed against M/s. Pfizoi Limited;

(b) whether it is a fact that for the three salts of Oxytctracycline the comoany charged a price varying

between Rs. 950/- to Rs.1085 -p and that they are producing about 50 tonnes of these thsee (bugs each year;

(c) whether it is *uho* a fact that Government fixed price was only Rs.650/- per kg. and even for one year the amount due from the company could be over rupees 2 crores on Oxytetracycline along: and

(d) if so, whether his Ministry has investigated the matter and if so, with what results and if not. what are the reasons therefor ?

THE MINISTER OF INDUSTRY (SHR1 J. VENGAL RAO) : (a) The details of drugs and its formulations involved in the assessment of the amount is quite large. The time & efforts required for collection of these will not be commensurate with the results likely to be achieved.

(b) to (d) The amount recoverable from the company on Oxytetracycline and its salts as worked out by the special Team is Rs. 41.46 lakhs. The undercharged prices by the company during April-November, 1981 have also been taken into account while calculating the said amount. The amount has also been assessed with reference to not realisation of the company and the notified price minus percentage/commissions paid by the company. The company implemented the notified prices since August, 1982.

Drugs Companies Involved in Supreme Court Litigation

455). SHRI CHANDRIKA PRASAD TRTPATHT:
SHRI RAJN1 RANI A.N SAHU :
DR. RATNAKAR PANDEY:

Will the Minister of INDUSTRY be pleased to refer to the answer to Unstarred Question 650 given in the Rajya Sibha on the 1st August, 1988 and state:

(a) how many companies were involved in Supreme Court litigation and what were the bulk drugs and formulations involved in each case;

(b) what were the prices fixed by Government for each bulk drug and formulation and what were the prices charged by the companies;

(c) when did each company implement the price of each bulk drug and formulation as fixed by Government initially and as a result of review;

(d) what are the basis on which the amount has been, assessed in each case along with the name of the drug and rate of difference; and

(e) in how many cases reviews arc yet to be completed and what are the details in respect of each case and by *when* the amount against these companies would be assessed *1*

THE MINISTER OF INDUSTRY (SHRT J. VENGAL RAO) : (a) Information to the extent available is given in the Statement *(See* below)

(b) The details of prices of drugs fixed by the Government and charged by the companies are quite voluminous. The time and efforts required for collection of these details